



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,583	10/06/2000	Mike G. Gyde	H0001641	1855

7590 07/15/2004

Honeywell International Inc
Law Department AB2
P O Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-9806

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NHON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,583

Applicant(s)

GYDE ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment D, filed 02/24/2004.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12, and 14 are independent claims. In the Amendment D, claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 12, and 14-17 are amended. This action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 12-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartel et al ("Hartel", US 5,454,074) in view of Crabill et al. ("Crabill", US 5,265,024).

As per independent claim 1, Hartel teaches a method of window management on a display, the display having a plurality of windows, wherein at least one window of the plurality of windows includes at least one checklist selection frame having a layout and a list of available checklists (checklist 72 and checklist 80 of fig. 4), and each of the available checklists having at least one task (task 74 of checklist 72 and task 84 of checklist 80 of fig. 4), said method comprising the steps of:

Receiving a selection for a selected checklist from the list of available checklists (select on *Normal* or *N-Normal* button; fig. 4);

storing the layout of the at least one checklist selection frame from which the selected checklist is selected (col. 9, lines 30-45); and

opening and displaying a window containing synoptic information related to said selected checklist (fig. 2).

Hartel does not disclose the synoptic information is a graphical overview of information wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist. Crabill discloses graphical overview of information displayed in figs. 3-5 when selecting on different categories (col. 6, line 37 – col. 7, line 68). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Crabill of displaying graphical overview of information when selecting on different categories in Hartel's system since it would allow a user to control the system efficiently by observing the graphical overview of information.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Hartel teaches the step of opening and displaying a window containing said graphical overview further comprises opening and displaying a synoptic frame including a synoptic page (fig. 2; the synoptic window in fig. 2 is also a synoptic frame).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Hartel teaches:

displaying the tasks of selected checklist (task 74 of checklist 72 and task 84 of checklist 80 of fig. 4);

receiving an indication of a selected task from said selected checklist (e.g. selecting on *Before Start* task of task list 74; fig. 4);

Art Unit: 2174

displaying in said synoptic frame a synoptic page associated with said selected task, at least partially while said selected task is displayed (synoptic frame of fig. 2 is changed associated with the selected task from task list 74 in fig. 4).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, according to Hartel's system, repeating said highlighting and synoptic page displaying steps for each task in said checklist is inherent; and

Hartel teaches restoring the stored frame layout (col. 9, lines 30-45).

As per claims 5 and 6, which are both dependent on claim 1, according to Hartel's system, window of fig. 2 is a FMS frame and a navigational frame.

As per independent claim 7, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

As per independent claim 12, it is rejected under the same rationale as claims 1 and 2.

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 12, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

As per independent claim 14, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 14, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

5. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartel in view of Crabill and further in view of Southgate (US 5,561,757).

As per independent claims 8, Hartel teaches a method of window management on a display device for a checklist containing a plurality of tasks, said display device having a first display presented thereon, said first display having a frame layout having a first window therein, said method comprising the steps of:

listing at least one of the plurality of tasks in the checklist on the first display (checklist 72 and checklist 80 of fig. 4);

receiving a selection for a selected task of the listed at least one task e.g. selecting on *Before Start* task of task list 74; fig. 4;

determining whether a synoptic window containing synoptic information is associated with said task, (synoptic frame of fig. 2 is changed associated with the selected task from task list 74 in fig. 4) and if so:

storing the frame layout of the first display in memory (col. 9, lines 30-45);

Hartel does not disclose the synoptic information is a graphical overview of information wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist. Crabill discloses graphical overview of information displayed in figs. 3-5 when selecting on different categories (col. 6, line 37 – col. 7, line 68). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Crabill of displaying graphical overview of information when selecting on different categories in Hartel's system since it would

Art Unit: 2174

allow a user to control the system efficiently by observing the graphical overview of information.

modified Hartel does not teach reducing the size of the first window to a reduced window and displaying the reduced window. However, Southgate teaches that in col. 3, lines 33-45 and in col. 8, lines 14-27. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Southgate of reducing the size of the first window in modified Hartel's system since it would fit more windows in the same display area;

Hartel further teaches displaying the synoptic window associated with said task while the reduced window is displayed (synoptic frame of fig. 2 is changed associated with the selected task from task list 74 in fig. 4);

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Hartel teaches:

determining that the end of the checklist has been reached (col. 5, lines 43-47);

determining that a frame layout is stored in memory; and restoring said stored frame layout (col. 9, lines 30-45).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 8.

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Hartel teaches storing the first page layout prior to said second page displaying step (col. 9, lines 30-45).

Art Unit: 2174

6. Claims 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartel in view of Crabill and further in view of Roe (US 6,529,137).

As per claims 15 and 17, which are dependent on claims 14 and 16 respectively, modified Hartel does not teach displaying the associated graphical overview includes the step of displaying a diagram. Roe discloses that in fig. 5 col. 4, lines 17-39). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Roe of displaying graphical overview includes the step of displaying a diagram in modified Hartel's system since it would help a user to understand more about the graphical overview.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiries

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-8318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5:30 PM with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
July 07, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100